

United States Patent and Trademark Office

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,659	01/24/2002	Kazushi Torii	43379	8146
1609	7590 09/24/2004		EXAM	INER
ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P. 1300 19TH STREET, N.W.			WOODWARD, ANA LUCRECIA	
SUITE 600	IREEI, IN. W.		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20036	1711		

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				سيزن
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	_	10/053,659	TORII ET AL.	
Office Action	on Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	•	Ana L. Woodward	1711	
The MAILING DA	TE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE MAILING DATE O - Extensions of time may be ava after SIX (6) MONTHS from the - If the period for reply specified - If NO period for reply is specified - Failure to reply within the set o.	F THIS COMMUNICATION. ilable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 e mailing date of this communication. above is less than thirty (30) days, a replyed above, the maximum statutory period of extended period for reply will, by statute e later than three months after the mailing	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE MON 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE g date of this communication, even if timely filed	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) This action is FIN	AL . 2b)⊠ This	$\frac{24}{2002}$, $\frac{4}{9}$, $\frac{2002}{2002}$, $\frac{4}{23}$, action is non-final.		
closed in accorda	nce with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			• •	
4) \ Claim(s) \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \	/are pending in the application	n 58, 64, 65, 71, 72 & 74. wn from consideration.	-17	}
	/are allowed 53-56, 59-63, 66-76 /are rejected.			
7)	/are objected to. re subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
Application Papers				•
9) The specification is	s objected to by the Examine	r.		
•	•	epted or b) objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Applicant may not re	equest that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj aminer. Note the attached Office	` '	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §				
12) Acknowledgment i a) All b) Some 1. Certified co 2. Certified co 3. Copies of the	s made of a claim for foreign * c) None of: pies of the priority documents pies of the priority documents	s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive	on No	
		of the certified copies not receive	d.	
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Pat 3) Notice of Draftsperson's Pat 3) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	ent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ment(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) 4/02 4/23/04	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)	,

Application/Control Number: 10/053,659

Art Unit: 1711

DETAILED ACTION

Modified Election/Restrictions

1. In light of Applicants' comments submitted June 22, 2004, the restriction requirement mandated in the last office action has been modified as follows:

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 37-47, 51, 52, 57, 58, 64, 65, 71, 72 and 74-77, drawn to a two-component system, classified in class 525, subclass various.
- II. Claims 48-50, 53-56, 59-63, 66-70, 73 and 78-81, drawn to a one-component system, classified in class 524, subclass various.
- 2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions II and I are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product (MPEP § 806.04(b), 3rd paragraph), and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.04(h)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as a molding or coating composition in and of itself without the presence of additional resin materials which would react in-situ to produce a mutually exclusive final product and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct since there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions anticipated by the prior

Application/Control Number: 10/053,659 Page 3

Art Unit: 1711

art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

- 3. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the reply filed on June 22, 2004 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the action does not identify which of the claims are directed to an intermediate and which are directed to the final product. In response, it maintained that the claims containing one component constitute the intermediate product and the claims containing more than one component constitute the final product. Applicants have not submitted evidence or identified such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admitted on the record that this is the case. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.
- 4. Claims 37-47, 51, 52, 57, 58, 64, 65, 71, 72 and 74-77 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected group, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on June 22, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U:S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Application/Control Number: 10/053,659

Art Unit: 1711

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 48-50, 53-56, 59-63, 66-70, 73 and 78-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over WO 95/22358.

The reference discloses absorbent structures and materials comprising a mixture of (1) a plurality of absorbent gelling particles comprising a water-insoluble, water-swellable polymer, and (2) an absorbent property modification polymer. Most preferred polymer materials for use in making the water-insoluble, water-swellable polymer are surface cross linked hydrogel-forming absorbent polymers, examples of such are partially neutralized polyacrylic acids meeting the requirements of applicants' acrylic acid and/or salt –based polymer (page 14, lines 24-37). See working examples, which demonstrate various absorbent materials meeting the terms of the present claims with respect to the types of materials added.

It is reasonably believed that the absorbent materials of the reference, being essentially the same as applicants', would inherently meet all property limitations governing the present claims. The onus is shifted to applicants to establish that the product of the present claims is not the same as or obvious from that set forth by the reference.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ana L. Woodward whose telephone number is (571) 272-1082. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James J. Seidleck can be reached on (571) 272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1711

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ana L. Woodward

Examiner

Art Unit 1711

AW